SECTION 5.0

ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES

CHAPTER 5.0

ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the alternatives analysis section in this EIR is to describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project that could feasibly attain the objectives of the project, and to evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. Alternatives have been selected that could reduce to a less-than-significant level or eliminate any significant adverse environmental effects of the proposed project, including alternatives that may be more costly or could otherwise impede the project's objectives. The range of alternatives considered includes those that offer substantial environmental advantages over the proposed project and may be feasibly accomplished in a successful manner considering economic, environmental, social, technological, and legal factors. The following specific alternatives are discussed below:

- Alternative Road Alignments (Alternative 1- East Corridor Alternative, Alternative 2- West Corridor Alternative)
- No Project Alternative

5.2 ALTERNATIVE 1- EAST CORRIDOR ALTERNATIVE

Under Alternative 1 (East Corridor Alternative), the proposed two-lane access road would connect Sunset Boulevard to Athens Avenue on a north-south alignment, east of the proposed project. **Figure 5-1** shows the alignment of this alternative with respect to the proposed project and Alternative 2 (West Corridor Alternative).

LAND USE

The land use impacts and mitigation measures identified in Section 4.2 for the proposed project (Alternative A) would be the same as those for this alternative.

TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

The transportation and traffic impacts and mitigation measures identified in Section 4.3 for the proposed project (Alternative A) would be the same as those for this alternative.

Insert Figure 5-1

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The hazards and hazardous materials impacts and mitigation measures identified in Section 4.4 for the proposed project (Alternative A) would be the same as those for this alternative.

NOISE

The noise impacts and mitigation measures identified in Section 4.5 for the proposed project (Alternative A) would be the same as those for this alternative.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

The geology and soil impacts and mitigation measures identified in Section 4.6 for the proposed project (Alternative A) would be the same as those for this alternative.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

The hydrology and water quality impacts and mitigation measures identified in Section 4.7 for the proposed project (Alternative A) would be the same as those for this alternative.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The biological resource impacts for this alternative include additional impacts to seasonal wetlands and vernal pools, in comparison with the proposed project. Mitigation measures, such as purchasing additional preservation bank acreage for vernal pool habitat, purchasing additional creation credit for vernal pool habitat from a United States Fish and Wildlife Service-approved bank, purchasing additional riparian mitigation credits through an appropriate mitigation bank, and purchasing additional credits of seasonal marsh habitat at a USACE approved wetland mitigation bank would be necessary to address these additional impacts.

AIR QUALITY

The air quality impacts and mitigation measures identified in Section 4.9 for the proposed project (Alternative A) would be the same as those for this alternative.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

The cultural resource impacts and mitigation measures identified in Section 4.10 for the proposed project (Alternative A) would be the same as those for this alternative.

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

The utility and service systems impacts and mitigation measures identified in Section 4.11 for the proposed project (Alternative A) would be the same as those for this alternative.

AESTHETICS

The aesthetic impacts and mitigation measures identified in Section 4.12 for the proposed project (Alternative A) would be the same as those for this alternative.

5.3 ALTERNATIVE 2 - WEST CORRIDOR ALTERNATIVE

Under Alternative 2 (West Corridor Alternative), the proposed two-lane access road would connect Sunset Boulevard to Athens Avenue on a north-south alignment, beginning at the northern end at the proposed project alignment (at Athens Avenue) and extending south towards its connection with Sunset Boulevard (west of the proposed project's Sunset Boulevard connection point). **Figure 5-1** shows the alignment of this alternative with respect to the proposed project and Alternative 2 (West Corridor Alternative).

LAND USE

The land use impacts and mitigation measures identified in Section 4.2 for the proposed project (Alternative A) would be the same as those for this alternative.

TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

The transportation and traffic impacts and mitigation measures identified in Section 4.3 for the proposed project (Alternative A) would be the same as those for this alternative.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The hazards and hazardous materials impacts and mitigation measures identified in Section 4.4 for the proposed project (Alternative A) would be the same as those for this alternative.

NOISE

The noise impacts and mitigation measures identified in Section 4.5 for the proposed project (Alternative A) would be the same as those for this alternative.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

The geology and soils impacts and mitigation measures identified in Section 4.6 for the proposed project (Alternative A) would be the same as those for this alternative.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

The hydrology and water quality impacts and mitigation measures identified in Section 4.7 for the proposed project (Alternative A) would be the same as those for this alternative.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The hydrology and water quality impacts and mitigation measures identified in Section 4.8 for the proposed project (Alternative A) would be the same as those for this alternative.

AIR QUALITY

The air quality impacts and mitigation measures identified in Section 4.9 for the proposed project (Alternative A) would be the same as those for this alternative.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

The cultural resource impacts for this alternative include impacts to recorded cultural resources. Mitigation measures would need to address these impacts.

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

The utility and service system impacts and mitigation measures identified in Section 4.11 for the proposed project (Alternative A) would be the same as those for this alternative.

AESTHETICS

The aesthetic impacts and mitigation measures identified in Section 4.12 for the proposed project (Alternative A) would be the same as those for this alternative.

5.4 NO-PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

Under the No-Project Alternative, the proposed two-lane access road connecting Sunset Boulevard to Athens Avenue would not be constructed or funded by UAIC. For the purposes of the environmental analysis for this alternative, it is assumed that the site would continue to be utilized for livestock grazing. Impacts associated with this alternative are discussed below.

LAND USE

Under the No-Project Alternative, the project site usage would remain as rangeland and would not be developed. While the No-Project Alternative would temporarily retain open space, the land is zoned for industrial use, and may be developed in the future.

TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Under the No Project Alternative, traffic would continue using Athens Avenue railroad crossing to access the landfill and points to the west. Emergency vehicles from the east would continue to have to pass through the Athens Avenue at-grade railroad crossing. The No-Project Alternative would not provide unimpeded access from State Route 65 to Athens Avenue.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Hazardous materials have not been currently used at the project site, nor are there any known hazardous material releases within one mile of the site. Since the land would continue to be used as pasture, the No-Project Alternative would not increase the risk of hazardous materials release or exposure.

NOISE

Under the No-Project Alternative, the site would continue to be utilized for cattle production purposes and would not result in significant noise impacts.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Under the No-Project Alternative, the topography and soils would remain in their current state as used for pasture. There would be no impacts related to geological and geotechnical stability or soil resources, other than those associated with cattle production.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Under the No-Project Alternative, there would be no negative impacts to water resources from construction-related activities, or loss of surface water quality due to drainage from impervious surfaces.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Under the No-Project Alternative, there would be no negative impacts to sensitive biological resources, such as vernal pools, seasonal wetland habitat, freshwater marsh habitat, and special-status plant and animal species; open space would be temporarily preserved. These are beneficial impacts of the No-Project Alternative.

AIR QUALITY

Under the No-Project Alternative, the site would continue to be utilized for grazing activities and would not result in significant air quality impacts.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Under the No-Project Alternative, the land would not be disturbed. This alternative would not result in any significant impact to cultural or paleontological resources.

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Under the No-Project Alternative, the land would remain as pasture. Therefore, no additional public facilities or services would be required of Placer County and there would be no need to expand the services to the site.

AESTHETICS

Under the No-Project Alternative, open space would be retained and there would be no change to the current aesthetics.

5.5 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

Generally, the environmentally superior alternative is the alternative that would cause the least damage to the environment. If the No-Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, the CEQA Guidelines, Section 1526.6(e)(2) requires the EIR to also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives that were considered in detail in the EIR. Because implementation of the No-Project Alternative would result in the avoidance of the environmental effects that would occur under the proposed project and other alternatives, the No-Project Alternative is considered to be the environmentally superior alternative. However, the No-Project Alternative would not achieve any of the project objectives.

The current road alignment of the proposed project, which incorporates parts of the alignments of both Alternative 1 and Alternative 2, was designed to minimize adverse impacts occurring on both Alternatives; in particular this alignment minimizes impacts to special status species habitats, jurisdictional wetlands, cultural resources, and property subdivision. The proposed project would meet the project objectives. Possible postponement of the connector road could result in a changed environmental setting where lands in immediate vicinity may be developed, this would limit road alignment choices, possibly forcing a roadway alignment upon sensitive biology, cultural, or other environmental resources. Based on the above discussion, the environmentally superior alternative is the proposed project.